

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,472	07/27/2006	Akio Taniguchi	5404/165	5181
757 BRINKS HOE	757 7590 03/20/2009 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE		EXAMINER MULLIS, JEFFREY C	
P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

_							
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/587,472	TANIGUCHI ET AL.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1796					

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee wave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (a) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, larger orduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extression thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid usinssal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). MMENDMENTS
B. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(a) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: The newly added limitation was not previously present and would therefore require further search and
consideration; "converted to crosslinked" makes no sense and would not place the case in better form for appeal. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).
7. 🔯 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔯 will not be entered, or b) 🔲 will be entered and an explanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>all</u> .
Claim(s) rejected. <u>an.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
0. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance
because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)
13. □ Other:

/Jeffrey C. Mullis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Application No.

Part of Paper No. 20090316

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that their composition is completely different from Goetz without pointing out specifically what the differences are. Applicants newly added limitation is not present in the claims of record and furthermore makes no sense. Limitations not present in the claims are given no weight and can't be said to distinguish over any of the art relied upon.